

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claim 2 is requested to be cancelled.

Claims 1, 8, 9, and 16 are currently being amended.

This amendment changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1, 3-20 are now pending in this application.

The Examiner issued a First Office Action dated April 5, 2006. The Examiner rejected claims 1-11, 14-16, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,799,917 (“Li”) or in the alternative under §103(a) as obvious over Li in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,478,275 (“Huang”). Claims 6, 7, 12, 13, and 17 were rejected under §103(a) as being obvious over Li in view of Huang.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, 9, and 16 to clarify the invention as claimed. In particular, Applicants have clarified the axes of rotation for the various connection points in the claimed invention and the slidably adjustable nature of the adaptor.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-11, 14-16, and 18-20 as being anticipated by Li, Applicants respectfully submit that Li fails to teach all of the limitations of the claims. Li teaches the use of a support bracket assembly pivotally mounted to a support arm and having an extendable keyboard support bracket, the support bracket assembly supporting a monitor from below. In contrast, claims 1 and 3-20 are directed to a video display adaptor which slidably extends downward from an overhead mounting position along a mounting arm. As the Examiner

states, Li does not disclose the rotational coupling of the tilt block to the mounting bracket as Applicants have claimed. In addition, Li does not disclose the adaptor being “slidably connected to the mounting arm, wherein the adapter is configured to slide towards and away from the tilt block along a longitudinal axis of the mounting arm.” The Examiner has interpreted the supporting bracket 27 of Li as an adaptor as claimed in the present application. However, Applicants respectfully note that the supporting bracket of 27 is designed to “be extended from the supporting bracket assembly 12 for supporting a keyboard.” (See Col. 3, Lns. 5-19) In contrast, the claims require that “the adapter [be] configured to accept a display device for mounting thereon.” The supporting bracket of Li is intended to support a keyboard in front of the supporting bracket assembly 17 that supports a video display. (See Figure 5) Li provides no teaching regarding using the keyboard support bracket as an adaptor for supporting a video display wherein the adaptor is also slidably connected to a mounting arm.

Additionally, Applicants submit that no other structure taught by Li describes an adaptor as claimed. The support bracket assembly of Li is “locked to the front portion of the supporting rod 22.” (See Col. 3, Lns. 13-15) Although, the keyboard support bracket of Li can be extended from the support bracket assembly for supporting a keyboard, as discussed above, the support bracket assembly itself is not extendable, but merely pivotable in relation to the mounting arm. Li does not teach an adaptor which is slidably, movably and operatively connected to the mounting arm. Rather, the support bracket assembly of Li is “locked” to the supporting rod at a front portion. In fact, Li teaches the use of a fixed position pivoting about an axis rather than positioning of the adaptor slidably along a single longitudinal axis of the mounting arm as claimed.

Furthermore, the components (13, 21, 22, and 12) of Li, which the Examiner has equated to the mounting arm of the present invention, are in fact several separate pieces which are connected by pivot points to allow the device of Li to pivot along multiple axes. The claims require that the adaptor slide along the single longitudinal axis of the mounting arm. As Li consists of a segmented structure with multiple pivot points, each segment has its own

longitudinal axis. As such, a slidable adaptor as claimed by the present invention could not be adapted to slide along what the Examiner characterizes as the mounting arm of Li. As Li fails to teach all of the elements of the claimed invention for at least the above stated reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections.

In addition to the above, the Li does not teach each of the limitations of the rejected dependent claims. Regarding to claims 3, 4, 14, 15, and 18, while the Examiner has stated that Li teaches “a lateral surface and a region between the lateral surface and planar surface”, Li does not in fact teach “a region between the lateral surface and a planar surface for accepting a power source for the device” as claimed. In contrast, Li teaches attaching the device to a surface using an anchoring base which is essentially a clamp. The design of Li provides for no space between the anchoring base and the surface for accepting a power source. Li also fails to teach a mounting bracket plate connected to the mounting bracket and positioned between the planar surface and the region. The portion of Li which the Examiner equates with Applicants’ mounting bracket plate is the biasing plate 26. However, Li teaches pressing the biasing plate against the planar surface to secure the device. Therefore, the biasing plate can not be positioned “between the planar surface and the region” as Applicants have claimed. As Li fails to teach all of the elements of claims 1 and 3-20, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection for at least these reasons.

In addition to the above, Applicants submit that Li fails to teach all of the limitations of claims 9-10 and 19-20. As discussed previously, Li fails to teach an adaptor slidably connected to the mounting arm. As noted above, the Examiner has improperly equated the keyboard support bracket 27 of Li with the adaptor of the claims 1 and 3-20. As such, Li also fails to disclose the specific sliding means claimed in claims 9-10 and 19-20. Additionally, as previously discussed, Li does not describe “at least one elongate track positioned on the mounting arm parallel with the single longitudinal axis”. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Li is silent as to the manner in which the keyboard support bracket extends from the supporting bracket assembly, merely showing a tubular area for receiving the cylindrical ends of

the keyboard support bracket in Figure 3. For at least the reasons stated above, the support bracket of Li is not an adaptor as claimed. As Li fails to teach all of the elements of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections under §102.

Regarding the rejection under §103 in light of the combination of Li and Huang, Huang fails to remedy the elements not taught by Li. Huang does not disclose the use of an adaptor which is slidably mounted to the mounting arm. In fact, Huang teaches the use of an adaptor (frame 22) which is pivotally connected to a segmented arm and cannot slide along a longitudinal axis of the mount arm. As stated above regarding Li, the segmented arm of Huang has multiple longitudinal axes and does not teach the use of a single longitudinal axis as claimed. Huang stresses the use of pivot points as a means to provide for an adjustable articulating mount. Neither Li or Huang, nor the combination of them would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to replace the pivotally mounted adaptor with a slidably mounted adaptor as claimed nor to replace the segmented arm with a mounting arm having a single longitudinal axis. As the combination of Li and Huang fails to render the claimed invention obvious, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections under §103.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1450. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1450. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1450.

Respectfully submitted,

Date July 5, 2006

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 27433
Telephone: (312) 832-4358
Facsimile: (312) 832-4700

By Marshall J. Brown

Marshall J. Brown
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,566